

REMARKS

The present *Supplemental Amendment* supplements the *Amendment* filed on January 5, 2006 (received by OIPE January 9, 2006), and is submitted further in response to the Official Action dated October 5, 2005. As noted in detail below, the *Supplemental Amendment* corrects antecedent basis in claims 8 and 13 and traverses the obviousness-type double patenting rejections in the Official Action.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on December 1, 2003; February 25, 2004; August 10, 2004; August 30, 2004 and May 2, 2005.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 13 are independent. Claims 8 and 13 have been amended to provide positive antecedent basis for "the electromagnetic energy," which was incorporated into claims 8 and 13 in the *Amendment* filed January 5, 2006. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Regarding the claim rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103, please refer to the arguments presented in the *Amendment* filed January 5, 2006.

In the *Amendment* filed January 5, 2006, the Applicants indicated an intention to file a *Terminal Disclaimer*. Upon further review, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims of the subject application are patentably distinct from the claims of the Zhang '784 and '244 patents. Therefore, a *Terminal Disclaimer* will not be filed, and the Applicants herein traverse the obviousness-type double patenting rejections.

Paragraph 7 of the Official Action rejects claims 4, 5 and 8-18 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,784 to Zhang et al.

As stated in MPEP § 804, under the heading "Obviousness-Type," in order to form an obviousness-type double patenting rejection, a claim in the present application must define an invention that is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in

the prior art patent, and the claimed subject matter must not be patentably distinct from the subject matter claimed in a commonly owned patent. Also, the patent principally underlying the double patenting rejection is not considered prior art.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Independent claim 4 recites a step of irradiating a semiconductor film with a laser light through a window having a slit shape while transferring a substrate so that a dopant species is introduced. Independent claims 8 and 13 recite a step of producing a plasma of a gas containing dopant species by applying an electromagnetic energy. Claims 1-23 of the Zhang '784 patent do not teach or suggest the above-referenced steps.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are not a timewise extension of the invention as claimed in the Zhang '784 patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections are requested.

Paragraph 8 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-18 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 5,424,244 to Zhang et al.


The Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Independent claim 1 recites a step of irradiating a linear laser beam to a surface of a semiconductor. While the claims of the Zhang '244 patent recite irradiating a laser beam, the claims of the Zhang '244 patent do not teach or suggest that the laser beam is a linear laser beam.

Independent claims 4 and 6 recite a step of transferring a substrate in a first direction and irradiating a semiconductor film with a laser light through a window having a slit shape. Independent claims 8 and 13 recite steps of introducing dopant species into an entirety of a line-shaped target portion of a substrate and changing a relative position of the substrate. The claims of the Zhang '244 patent do not teach or suggest the above-referenced steps.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are not a timewise extension of the invention as claimed in the Zhang '244 patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections are requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789